

**REMARKS**

The outstanding Action dated December 23, 2002, has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 14 have been amended to further set forth the application, and claim 22 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-21 are now pending and submitted for consideration.

**Section 102 Rejection**

**Claims 1, 2, 3 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Salm et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,396, hereinafter *Salm*).**

The rejection with respect to claim 22 is now moot in view of cancellation thereof.

Referring to claims 1-3, the present invention as recited thereof is directed to a telephone apparatus which comprises an operating unit, display unit, control unit and storage unit. Particularly, when a numeric key on the operating unit is pressed for a predetermined period, a book mode is activated so that a search for a name that includes a character corresponding to the pressed numeric key can be performed, yielding a search result which is subsequently processed and displayed. An object of the claimed invention is to protect a function called "memory direct search", which realizes an immediate search for items of phone book information by a long press of a numeric key, and the subsequent display of the items that have been indexed by the numeric key.

**Salm** discloses a radio telephone set that includes a keypad, display, central control unit and memory means (see Fig. 4). Particularly, when a key in the keypad is activated for a duration that is longer than a set time interval, a memory controlled selection mode is invoked (see column 3, lines 32-34).

Claim 1 from which claims 2 and 3 depend has been amended to more specifically set forth the phone book mode, which is activated when a numeric key is pressed for at least a predetermined time (see, e.g., pages 15, 16 and 20 of the specification). Accordingly, the present invention as now set forth in claim 1-3 is clearly distinguishable from **Salm**. For instance, instead of entering a memory controlled selection mode to automatically select a first character from a group of characters assigned to a key based on time-controlled actuation of the key as taught by **Salm**, the claimed invention now specifically requires the activation of a book mode to enable a search of a name that includes a character corresponding to a pressed numeric key which has been pressed for a predetermined time. Moreover, the newly added limitation "without receiving any other key operation" requires that the "book mode" as recited in claims 1-3 not to necessitate a selection operation for the first character that is shown in "a memory controlled selection mode" of **Salm** (see, e.g., step 18 in Fig. 2).

In short, **Salm** neither discloses nor suggests the claimed invention which requires searching while in a book mode that is activated by pressing a key for a predetermined time.

Section 103 Rejections

**Claims 2-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Salm* in view of Cushman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,125,287, hereinafter *Cushman*).**

*Cushman* is directed to a wireless telephone which allows a user to review a list of names or information stored in one or more memory locations. *Cushman* is cited by the outstanding Action for teaching display update means for displaying a name not currently on a display while being updated.

However, *Cushman* does not compensate for the above-discussed deficiency of *Salm* regarding the book mode activation to trigger a search function based on a pressed key of a predetermined period. Therefore, claims 2-6, which depend from claim 1, are distinguishable over *Salm* and *Cushman* for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. It is also noted that none of the cited portions of *Cushman* discloses or suggests the display update operation as recited in claims 2-6.

Additionally, the present invention as set forth in claim 4 uses a letter included in a name, and a group classification corresponding to the name, as two different index keys used for searching the name. Accordingly, the first long press of a numeric key enables the names including the letter assigned to the numeric key to be found, and the second long press of the same numeric key enables the names corresponding to the group classification assigned to that numeric key to be found.

As described in the embodiment, the group classification is a mere number to which a user can arbitrarily give meaning (see, e.g., Fig. 2). For instance, a user may

assign numbers 1, 2 and 3 to amateur baseball team members, restaurants, and members of the parent-teacher association, respectively. As a result, a list of names for the member of the amateur baseball team can be obtained with merely two long presses of the numeric key 1.

The convenience of finding the desired list of names of people belonging to the same group with just two long presses is even more prominent when a large number of data sets are recorded. Such convenient structure according to claim 4 is neither disclosed nor taught by **Salm** and **Cushman**, individually or in combination.

**Claims 7-9, 11-12, 14-16 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Salm in view of Cushman and further in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,475,013, hereinafter Lee).**

**Lee** is directed to an automatic telephone dialing system which has a large memory capacity to store numbers and which can retrieve a particular name that corresponds to a particular number dialed. **Lee** is cited by the outstanding Action for displaying a name which is different from other names during a selection state. **Lee**, however, does not teach or suggest activating a book mode by pressing a key for a predetermined time to trigger a search function.

Claims 7-9, 11 and 12, which depend from claim 1, are therefore distinguishable over **Salm**, **Cushman** and **Lee** for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 since **Lee** fails to supplement for the above-discussed deficiencies of **Salm** and **Cushman** regarding the activation of a phone book mode to initiate a search.

As to claims 14-16 and 20, independent claim 14 from which claims 15, 16 and 20 depend has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 to specifically define a phone book mode which is activated when a numeric key is pressed for at least a predetermined time. As such, claims 14-16 and 20 are now patentable over ***Salm***, ***Cushman*** and ***Lee*** since they do not disclose or suggest, either individually or in combination, any book mode, which is activated by pressing a key for a predetermined time, to trigger a search function.

Claims 13, 19 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Salm*** in view of ***Cushman***, further in view of ***Lee***, and further in view of ***Landry et al.*** (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,602, hereinafter ***Landry***).

***Landry*** discloses a system for storing and dialing telephone numbers using a telephone set, and is cited by the outstanding Action for teaching repeatedly pressing of a repertory key. However, ***Landry*** lacks any teaching with respect to activating a book mode by pressing a key for a predetermined time to trigger a search function.

Claim 13, which depends from claim 1, is therefore distinguishable over ***Salm***, ***Cushman*** and ***Landry*** for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 since ***Landry*** fails to compensate for the above-discussed deficiencies of ***Salm*** and ***Cushman*** regarding the phone book mode triggering the search function.

As to claims 19 and 21, which depend from claim 14, they are distinguishable over ***Salm***, ***Cushman*** and ***Landry*** for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim

14 since **Landry** fails to supplement for the above-discussed deficiencies of **Salm** and **Cushman** regarding the phone book mode triggering the search function.

Claims 10, 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Salm** in view of **Cushman**, further in view of **Lee**, and further in view of **Helin et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,439, hereinafter **Helin**).

**Helin** discloses a mobile telephone user interface which can interpret a pressed key according to certain duration to yield certain functions. **Helin** is cited in item 7 of the outstanding Action as teaching the interpretation of a pressed key according to certain duration so that user interface functions can be preserved while simplifying the telephone by reducing the number of keys. However, **Helin** does not teach or suggest activating a book mode by pressing a key for a predetermined time to trigger a search function.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1, and therefore is distinguishable over **Salm**, **Cushman** and **Helin** for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 since **Helin** does not supplement the above-discussed deficiencies of **Salm** and **Cushman** regarding the phone book mode triggering the search function.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 14, and are therefore distinguishable over **Salm**, **Cushman** and **Helin** for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 14 since **Helin** fails to supplement for the above-discussed deficiencies of **Salm** and **Cushman** regarding the phone book mode triggering the search function.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-21 recites subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited

prior art. Applicants submit that this subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unobvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants therefore request that each of claims 1-21 be found allowable, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300.

Respectfully submitted,



Raymond J. Ho  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 41,838

**Customer No.: 004372**  
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6000  
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RJH:elz  
183928\_1.DOC